act as administrators, or that the probate courts should not subsequently appoint them to such positions. The power of the state over the probate courts is exclusive, and they have such powers and only such as the Legislature gives them. The act of Congress was not an attempt to invest probate courts with a power of appointment they did not possess before, but it was an authorization to national banks to accept appointments when the probate courts were authorized to make them. As those courts cannot now make such appointments, it necessarily follows that national banks cannot be appointed. They have no vested right to exercise that trust, and can only enjoy the privilege when the appointing power is authorized to appoint them."

Corporations; Rights of Minority Stockholders. — Heublin v. Wright, 227 Fed. 667.—In this case it was held that while in general a court is without authority to interfere with the management of the business of a corporation by a majority of its stockholders, yet their action in a matter in which their personal interests are opposed to the interests of the corporation is subject to review by the courts at the instance of minority stockholders. In the case before the court it appeared that the president, secretary-treasurer and a selling agent of the corporation, who were all members of the same family, owned a majority of the stock, and constituted a majority of the board of directors. The plaintiff was the owner of about one-third of the stock of the corporation. It was held that he was entitled to relief against the action of the defendants, as officers and directors of the corporation, in fixing their own salaries as officers at amounts which were unreasonably high, in view of the business and earnings of the corporation, and largely in excess of the value of the services rendered to the corporation; and this, although the same salaries had been in effect for a number of years, during the time when the business was more prosperous.

Constitutional Law—Class Legislation.—Laws (N. H.) 1915, c. 109, § 34, providing that no trust company, banking company, or similar corporation shall hereafter be appointed administrator of an estate, executor under a will, or guardian or conservator of the person or property of another, is not unconstitutional as class legislation, since it is apparent that banks were not arbitrarily made a class for the purpose of discrimination.